PRISM

AN ANGLICAN MONTHLY

September 1961 Vol. V No. 9 1s. 6d.

BISHOPS AND CLERGY

PRISM

177 REGENT STREET

LONDON, W.1

Telephone: REGent 0911

Editor:

TIMOTHY BEAUMONT

Editorial Advisory Committee:

DONALD ALLCHIN

ROBIN DENNISTON

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN

ROBIN MINNEY

NICHOLAS MOSLEY

Subscription rates (*post free*):

3 months, 5s.

6 months, 10s.

12 months, 20s.

Prism can be obtained at Church bookshops

THIS MONTH

		Page
BISHOPS	The Bishop of Llandaff	1
THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES	Bishop Stephen Neill	7
LETTERS FROM BILBO	ed. John Gunstone	11
BLUE-PRINT FOR A RURAL DEANERY	Canon S. Val Green	17
A PLEA FOR THE ORDINATION OF CHILDREN	J. S. Cowan	20
MEMORANDUM	Lt.-Col. H. E. Madge	25
COMMENT		34
LETTERS		38
REVIEWS	Esther de Waal, T.W.B. R.D., Peter Whiteley	47
POETRY	Eleanor Tarver, Anthony Hyland, Frank Buchanan	54
PRECIOUS STONES	S. M. M. Crichton	58

Bishops

BISHOP OF LLANDAFF

(*Being two extracts from the Introductory Essay to "Bishops" edited by the Rt. Rev. Glyn Simon, Bishop of Llandaff, to be published by the Faith Press on 2nd October at 18s. Among the contributors are the Bishops of Southwark, Western New York and Woolwich, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool, the Metropolitan of Myra and the late Dr. Norman Sykes.*)

The relevance of bishops to the twentieth-century Englishman seems by no means clear. Why is this? There are a number of reasons.

First of all, though individual bishops often write or speak quite lucidly, when "the bishops" write or speak corporately they do so in English that people do not use any longer, if indeed they ever did. "Yet among our people (as is so greatly shown in these days)" ran 'A Message from the Bishops to the people of Great Britain' in 1941, "is abundant vigour, real if untutored idealism, a splendid capacity for faith and service." Who else was writing like that in 1941? And it is still going on, for there came from the last Lambeth Conference, about half-way through, an emanation about Peace, written in much the same kind of way, which caused no stir at all; its meaning was concealed in what can only be called *episcopalese*, for there is no other language like it; it is as unique and inexplicable as episcopal attire. What causes it? Partly the fact that these efforts are almost always the joint work of a committee or a sub-committee; partly that there is too great an anxiety to steer a middle course and to avoid extremes at almost all costs; and partly, I am afraid, it is due to a loss of touch with the ordinary contemporary world, which grows sharper as bishops grow older. I did not agree with the evidence given by various clergymen at the Lady Chatterley trial, but it did have the merit of showing that they were aware of some aspects of the contemporary situation and could think and talk like other people. Yet, even here, some of the phrases used revealed an unawareness of the incapacity

of many of today's newspaper readers to grasp anything like an ecclesiastical metaphor or comparison.

Another possible explanation of the irrelevance of bishops is to be found in the uniformity of their background. Thirty-four out of forty-four bishops in Canterbury and York at the last Lambeth Conference had been educated in English Public Schools and all but three in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. This in no way reflects the present educational background of the immense majority of their flocks, and is almost certain to result in a particular viewpoint, a particular approach to problems, a particular outlook on life, and particular class likes and dislikes which, despite themselves, are bound to be of great influence. This means, for example, that bishops take for granted certain standards of living for themselves and for their families, that their children must go to the same kind of schools as they did themselves, that their companions and social milieu will be what theirs was, admirable in their way and with many virtues, but not those of the great majority of the people whom they exist to serve. There is no doubt that married bishops, like married clergy, are what the average Anglican wants despite the acute problems raised by both. Looking at things broadly, he is probably right, but he must then face the fact that the likelihood of a married bishop achieving anything like a major social break-through is remote; he has his wife and children to think of; he has given hostages to fortune. Yet without a break-through of this kind, and if it comes it must involve the general body of the clergy as well as the bishops, I see no hope of the Church of England being anything but essentially the Church of the middle classes. It makes hardly any appeal to the industrial and rural worker (nor very much, for different reasons, to the aristocrat or the artist). What is required is a change of outlook of so radical a kind, and a conception of what bishops ought to be and how they ought to live so completely new, that nothing in Church history suggests that it will come about voluntarily. Of course the problem is not peculiar to the Provinces of Canterbury and York, or even to the Anglican Communion. The Welsh Bishops are much nearer to the bulk of their people in social and educational background than their English brethren, and are probably, for the most part, much nearer to their clergy, but they still live in houses which suggest something quite different. It is not enough that bishops should live simply, as most of them

do; they must be *seen* to live simply. It is obvious, for example, that few people looking at the house I live in, which is modest compared to the old episcopal Palace, really believe me when I say that we live in it with no resident staff, and no staff at all at weekends. Such places perpetuate the widely held belief that bishops are as well-to-do as their pre-disestablishment predecessors, who in several instances lived in the same house on stipends of £4,500 a year *in those days*. It is difficult today to see why the Bishop of Llandaff should live in a house of the style he does, while in the same city the Roman Catholic Archbishop is content to live in a modest house in a street and the President of the Methodist Conference in a still more modest one in a suburb. (It is perhaps worth noting that in the pastoral care of both of these distinguished clerics, the working-man and the poor though not as numerous as they might be, are by no means the rare birds they sometimes are with us.) Much of the space in the over-large and grandiose houses in which too many bishops still live is taken up by rooms wholly given over to diocesan administration and office accommodation. They not only give a misleading picture of episcopal living standards, but do in fact cost the Church authorities much more than they can or ought to afford. There is much to be said for separating altogether episcopal office and domestic accommodation. Let the bishop live in a much smaller house, and let his office needs be seen and recognised for what they are, part of his official life which he cannot escape and which needs space in which to discharge it.

* * *

Doubtless it is true that as *things are at present* the method by which the Church of England gets her bishops, though hard to defend in theory, works out as well in practice as any other. But whether things will obligingly remain as they are at present, and whether this is a good enough defence of a system in so solemn and weighty a matter is a very different question. There is a principle at stake, which indeed involves the whole question of Establishment and thereby, ultimately, the whole relationship of the rest of the Anglican Communion to the two Provinces of Canterbury and York, the only parts of it which are "By law established". If only for historical reasons Canterbury and York are bound by what they do or do not do to have a great influence upon Anglicans outside their borders. For example,

it is surely desirable that however great may be the variations in Eucharistic *ceremonial*, the Eucharistic *Rite* should be recognisably the same and express the same theological principles throughout the Anglican Communion. But how is this to be achieved when the Rites drawn up by the Provinces of Canterbury and York must first win the approval of the unpredictable Commons? Incidentally, when the Church of England makes much of episcopacy as the focus of unity, sceptical onlookers are apt to ask awkward questions. For example, is it not difficult to relate this claim to the fact that by at least one extreme party in the Church of England the House of Commons is liable to be used as a threat wherewith to control or render abortive canonical and liturgical reforms approved by the representative organisations of the Church but obnoxious to the particular party concerned? It is not a good thing that the guidance that most Anglicans look to from Canterbury and York should sometimes have to be given with an anxious glance over the shoulder at Parliament; "Will the House of Commons stand it?" Sometimes this attitude is merely irritating, but when it is adopted, as it has been more than once recently, in matters of morals, doctrine and worship, it becomes positively dangerous. Certainly it makes the "Claims of the Church of England" to echo in the ears of other Christians as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. Not all would go as far as the reviewer of Canon Smyth's life of Archbishop Garbett who wrote in the *New Statesman*—"We live in a society and under a ruling class whose values are simply incompatible with Christianity. . . . But the Christian Church has tied itself inextricably to the present form of society and to its ruling values. So that we have a Church with a vocabulary which has lost its Christian substance and is used instead to clothe the *status quo*. The substance has gone elsewhere." These are hard words, but there is sufficient truth in them to call for a much more searching examination of the price paid for Establishment than the Church of England has yet been ready to face. Part of that price is the present method of appointment of bishops. The men appointed are good men, anxious to do their duty, often distinguished, always industrious, frequently of independent mind, and in many cases no doubt better than bishops whom the Church would have chosen for herself. But that is just what they have not been, and no amount of consultations between the sovereign, the prime minister, the archbishop and the

various ecclesiastical grey eminences who arise from time to time can obscure this fact. When a Church chooses her own bishops, mistakes are certainly made, for no system of election is infallible, but at least they are her own mistakes, for which she can repent and learn from them by bitter experience to do better another time. Had the Church been free to choose her fathers-in-God for herself it is at least possible that many of the political bishops in the England of the eighteenth century would never have been chosen, and it is certain that the long succession of ambitious Englishmen who were imposed upon the Church in Wales for so long, with such heavy consequences, would never have been suffered. It is odd that this particular aspect of episcopacy in the Church of England has not been more dwelt upon than it seems to have been in ecumenical discussions with non-episcopal Churches, for failure to do so involves a denial of the main reasons why most of them exist.

For the great majority of Englishmen, whose connection with the Established Church of their country is tenuous indeed, it involves the obstinate conviction that that Church is a State Church, paid by the State and under obligation to it, committed to the defence of things as they are. Here is, in the last resort, the greatest obstacle to the recognition of the episcopate as what by its origin it claims to be, something which is of the essence of the Church of God, given to the Church by God through Christ Himself. Combined with the other sociological obstacles which this essay has glanced at it means that for those multitudes for whom Christ died, the hewers of wood and drawers of water "without whom shall not a city be inhabited"—the bishops of Christ's Church, for all their goodness and sincerity, are with "them" and not with "us". I write in no spirit of self-righteous criticisms, for I write from a dis-established Province where much has still to be forgotten and many new lessons have still to be learned. We know something of the freedom which Disestablishment brings and something of the price which has to be paid for that freedom. But we know, too, though we are not always ready to admit it, that the habits of mind and ways of thought which Establishment stamps upon a Church do not easily disappear, and that after nearly half a century we still have far to go before we see a new vision, or rather, see again the apostolic vision, of the office of a bishop in the Church of God.

Burning Coals of Fire

Violet Welton

"Should be compulsory reading for any Christian who is in the least tempted to see the Church's present achievement through rose-tinted spectacles." *Church Times.*

A Seraph Book, **5s.**

The Sierra Leone Church

Raymond S. Foster

This objective and compelling study of the independent Anglican Church of the country comes appropriately in the year of Sierra Leone's political independence. Bishop Stephen Neill, in the *Foreword*, calls it "Exciting, heroic, frustrating, perplexing history"—but a history insistently centred upon the present. For the contemporary situation in Sierra Leone offers to the Anglican Communion at large a challenge—"Come over into Macedonia and Help us!" **3s. 6d.**

Cranmer's Selected Writings

Carl S. Meyer

"Professor Meyer has made his selection from Cranmers' sermons, prayers, and letters, and has himself added a useful introduction and bibliography. The book illustrates Cranmer's views, particularly in regard to the three major topics of the Scriptures, Justification, and the Eucharist. Dr. Meyer has rendered a valuable service to both the student and the general reader." *View Review.* *A Seraph Book*, **6s.**

S·P·C·K

The World Council of Churches

BISHOP STEPHEN NEILL

The important thing about the World Council of Churches is that it exists. After the first Assembly of the World Council held at Amsterdam in 1948, it was interesting to observe the reaction of laymen; again and again came the comment, "At last the Churches are doing something sensible; why couldn't they have done this before?"

In the east twelve years the World Council has met with almost exaggerated adulation, and also with somewhat acrimonious criticism. The adulation has come from those who appear to think that it is qualified of itself to deal with most of the evils of our divided world, and that the unity for which we seek is already to be found in it. The criticisms, in part at least based on misunderstandings, but none-the-less important, seem to spring from three different but related fears:

1. That for all its disclaimers, the World Council may in fact arrogate to itself the authority of a super-Church, and usurp functions which belong only to the churches as such;

2. That the World Council may lead the Churches to some kind of pan-Protestant union, and so in the end may increase the historic tensions between the Churches rather than resolve them;

3. That in its eager search for unity, the Council may neglect essential elements in the life of the Church, without due attention to which an alleged unity can be no more than a parody of true union.

It would be too much to claim that the Council has all the time escaped all these dangers; but a glance at its history will show how very well aware of them it has always been, and how careful it has been to guard against the impudences into which enthusiastic but uncritical supporters could easily have led it.

1. It is interesting to contrast the prudence of the Council with the well-meant but perhaps unfortunate proposal made at the meeting of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in America

that that Council should forthwith begin to act as though it was a Church, should itself ordain ministers, and should accept congregations into fellowship with itself without going through the channels of the existing denominations. No such proposal has ever been made in a World Council meeting. If such should be made, there can be no doubt as to the immediate rejection of the proposal.

2. It is true that the majority of the member Churches of the Council are Protestant. But in fact some of the most sensational achievements of the Council have been precisely in the field of Roman Catholic and Orthodox relationships.

The Vatican has now appointed a commission for ecumenical affairs. This is the direct result of the intense and unwavering interest taken by a number of leading Roman Catholics, principally in France and Belgium, in the Council and all its affairs. The Vatican has passed through successive stages of condemnation, caution, and qualified approval. The existence of the commission does not mean that the Vatican will now give permission for unrestricted participation by Roman Catholics in ecumenical affairs; it does mean that it has been driven, perhaps unwillingly, to take note of the ecumenical movement as one of the principal factors in the Christian history of our times.

For years the Church of Moscow has remained suspicious, not to say hostile, to the movement. It seemed impossible to cure the Russians of their profound suspicion that the movement was a political concern under the control of American capitalism. Gradually the ice has melted; the presence of a World Council delegation in Moscow, and of observers from the Russian Church at the Central Committee of the World Council at Rhodes in 1959 and at St. Andrews in 1960 were clear indications of a changed attitude. On 27th April it was announced that this gradual rapprochement had culminated in the formal application by the Russian Orthodox Church for membership of the World Council. The Russians will still have their criticisms to make—but in the ecumenical world the right of free criticism is one of the most jealously preserved privileges of all the participating Churches.

3. The World Council has steadfastly refused to put forward any detailed programme of unification, as a blue-print which the Churches ought to follow. It stands uncompromisingly for the two principles of the unity and renewal of the Church. But it has always officially stood for realism, and in this connection this means honest recogni-

tion of the gravity of the theological problems involved in any union. Indeed, one of the criticisms directed against the Council is that, so far from pressing the Churches in the direction of premature and ill-thought unions, it has so stressed the difficulties as to discourage those Churches which have been moving in the direction of organic union.

Even when such criticisms as these have been disposed of, it is still fair to ask the far more radical question as to the real effectiveness of the ecumenical movement today. Does it really amount to very much? Does the reality of it in any way correspond to the claims made for it by the more optimistic of its supporters?

Certainly it is prudent to make only modest claims. But the critical friend of the movement is entitled to point out that its influence extends far beyond such results as are measurable and calculable.

The essential thing about the movement is that it has engaged on a long-term policy of the education of the Churches in the persons of their leaders and representatives. Great assemblies such as Amsterdam and Evanston hit the headlines and attract widespread attention; but they express no more than perhaps ten per cent of what is really happening. Almost without a break, small meetings are taking place, at the Ecumenical Institute near Geneva and elsewhere, at which groups of perhaps thirty Christians—Church historians, journalists, theological students, missionaries on leave, and so forth—live together and educate one another in an atmosphere of friendliness and frank speaking.

The best friends of the Council are prepared to recognise that it is at present passing through a period of danger, as the first creative enthusiasm tends to sink down into mere use and wont.

There is the danger that the Council might become so much occupied with its practical concerns as to forget the significance of theological thought in its life. The decision, taken in 1960, to strengthen the department of Faith and Order shows that the Council itself is aware of this danger.

There is the danger that the Council might degenerate into a clearing-house for polite diplomatic exchanges between the Churches, without the sharp edge of judgment and challenge. Here it is the Churches themselves that are called to be the watch-dogs, and to see that the Council is kept awake and alert.

There is the perpetual danger of size. Parkinson's law operates as devastatingly in the ecclesiastical world as in any other. The World

Council already has many departments and committees, and is always under pressure to produce new ones. One main task of the next Assembly (1961) should perhaps be to consider very carefully what, if anything, each department is contributing, and perhaps to plan a radical simplification of the work.

For it has to be admitted that the Council has not yet brought about any great new spiritual movement in the Churches. It has propounded admirable principles; it has not created a glow of new devotion.

Perhaps the integration of the World Council with the International Missionary Council, planned to take place next year, may come just at the right moment to lift the Council to new levels of effectiveness and spiritual achievement. The ecumenical movement was born out of the missionary movement. Now the two are to be brought together again. Will the Churches take seriously what is involved? If they do, the results may prove nothing short of revolutionary.

It is from the younger Churches that the pressure for organic union comes most strongly. This is at times imprudent and injudicious. But, if it continues, the ecumenical movement may be driven to withdraw from its extremely cautious attitude on questions of union, and, without attempting to dictate to the churches, to adopt an attitude of rather more confident and dynamic leadership.

Integration might drive the Churches back on their own origins, and to a discovery of those new resources in the Gospel for which our tangled and distressful age so urgently cries aloud. In so far as the ecumenical movement has managed to produce a new slogan, it is this, "The whole Church bringing the whole Gospel to the whole world".

Letters from Bilbo

Extracts from some Angelic Correspondence

Edited by JOHN GUNSTONE

No. 1

Ref.: Eng/Nil/BB8
Your Holiness,

Thank you for your Holiness' last letter. Since I wrote another matter has come to my notice and I feel it is so serious that I ought to place the facts before your Holiness immediately. It concerns the state of the Church Militant (Anglican branch) in Nilborough.*

For centuries, through all the upheavals of Reformation, Commonwealth and Restoration, the faithful of Nilborough have worshipped in their magnificent medieval parish church, dedicated in honour of the Blessed Mother. Then, about the middle of the last century, the railway approached the town, and the townsfolk, being suspicious of the new invention, insisted that the station should be built about three-quarters of a mile from the centre on Northmoor Common. After the railway came the industries, and with the industries thousands of people, and Northmoor Common changed into a dirty suburb with factories and streets of terraced houses.

The faithful at the parish church were very disturbed by these events. They knew that as Christians they should be prepared to welcome the newcomers, but their pride hindered them from wanting working-class people in St. Mary's, so in the end they built a new church on Northmoor, St. Leo's, and appointed a priest-in-charge. (St. Leo's, by the way, is a monstrosity—quite as hideous as the factories around it. The architect is now in Purgatory, and I feel that his church at Northmoor should be included in the charges against him.)

As your Holiness doubtless knows, churches like St. Leo's tended to elaborate the ceremonial of their liturgy over the turn

* For obvious reasons the name of this town has been disguised. It may be somewhere in England, but it is emphatically *not* Romford in Essex.—J.G.

of the century, and the church at Northmoor was no exception. There were unpleasant incidents involving the archdeacon, the Kensitites and the vicar of St. Mary's, and relations between the two churches deteriorated rapidly. In the end St. Leo's became a separate parish, though the two churches are not more than seven minutes walking distance from each other. I think it is probably true to say that this division of the old parish marks the decline in the Church's influence in Nilborough.

After the First World War there was more development on the south side of the town, Southwood. Expensive villas and semi-detached houses were built for the professional people of Nilborough, together with many others who worked in the city. Among the Southwood inhabitants there was a small group of the faithful who agitated for a church of their own. News of this reached the evangelical society, who offered to build the church if they were given the right of presentation to the living. The diocesan bishop at the time was low church, and the vicar of St. Mary's too old to care, so the church of the Good Shepherd was built and the Southwood estate made into another parish.

During the war Northmoor was badly damaged by bombs, so when peace was restored the town council bought many acres of farmland on the east side of the town and rehoused about eight thousand people on an estate which they called Eastfield. The diocesan authorities purchased a plot of land and erected a cheap dual-purpose church-cum-hall, dedicated in honour of St. Richard. It was served for a time by a curate of St. Mary's, but now Eastfield has been made a conventional district as the first step to becoming yet another parish. In the meantime, St. Leo's has lost most of its population. A big bus station has been laid out next to the church, and plans are being made for a college for further education to be built nearby.

This carving-up of the old parish of Nilborough has had a disastrous effect on the cause of the Kingdom. In fact, the Church —as the Church Militant—has ceased to exist. In its place are four separate congregations with no visible connection with each other and no obvious common faith and way of life. As far as I can discover, the clergy rarely meet, and make no effort to co-operate with each other at all. I need hardly elaborate on the shortcomings of their congregations. Opportunities of presenting the Gospel are missed every day.

Finally, as an illustration of the Church's weakness, I can quote these figures: in the four parishes only a total of 390 of the faithful received communion on Easter Day last year, that is, about one out of every two hundred of the population of the area.

Would your Holiness please consider the matter and advise what ought to be done? Does this desperate situation warrant a miracle?

I remain,
Yours obediently,
BILBO*
(XIIth Legion).

No. 2

Ref.: Eng/Nil/M45
My dear Bilbo,

Thank you for your letter. The description you give could apply to many parts of that branch of the Church Militant over which you are watching, I'm afraid.

Could you please send me a little more information? I would like to know what special interests or abilities the various clergy and congregations in Nilborough possess before I assess what must be done. It may, as you suggest, be necessary to employ a miracle to remedy the situation.

Yours, a servant of the ministering spirits of God,
MICHAEL
(Archangel).

No. 3

Ref.: Eng/Nil/BB9
Your Holiness,

Here are some notes on each of the churches in Nilborough, prepared as requested.

St. Mary's. The old parish church gave me the impression of being like an ageing mother who has lost her children. The congregations are fair, but elderly. A parish eucharist was introduced a few years ago and competes with a cathedral-type mattins for popularity. I felt that the worship of the church was dominated by the choir and organ, in the way one usually finds in churches

* This must be a nickname. I have not been able to discover any angel called by this name in the tradition of the church.—J.G.

which are proud of what they call their "musical tradition". There is much devotion among the laity, and they could be trained and used if organised properly. Unfortunately the vicar, a saintly man, is swamped with parochial business, especially a restoration appeal: this is a pity, for he is a keen educationalist, and takes great interest in the church school. The buildings of the school are in a bad way. As I flew over the parish it struck me that if the grounds of the present school could be merged with the land on which the parish hall stands and the garden of the vicarage, it would form an ideal site for a new school.

St. Leo's. The interior of this church is very dreary. Fr. Smith, the vicar, ministers devotedly to the sick, for he feels this is his real vocation, so he has little interest in other parochial activities. Few people now live in the parish. People in Nilborough who like high church ceremonial come on Sunday mornings to the sung mass at eleven, and I must say the servers did their job reverently and accurately. The most enterprising members of the congregation absorb themselves in religious drama and produce plays in church during—oddly enough! —the penitential seasons.

The Good Shepherd. Except for a neglect of eucharistic worship and the sacramental means of grace, the people of the Good Shepherd are the most active of all the faithful in Nilborough. Their vicar has a keen appreciation of the Church's mission to the world, and he is a moving, expository preacher. There are highly-organised Sunday Schools and Bible classes in the church on Sunday mornings (Southwood is one of those areas where there is a good supply of voluntary leaders and teachers), and in the evening the church is packed to capacity for a hearty, hymn-singing service that follows roughly the pattern of evensong. Trained visiting teams call on all houses in the parish every three months in vigorous campaigns for conversions. The vicar is chaplain of Southwood Hospital, but, unlike Fr. Smith, has little idea of the benefits of sacramental grace to the sick.

St. Richard's. The life of this tiny group of the faithful is grievously hampered by the tendency of priests-in-charge to leave every two or three years. I think this is because the bishop always appoints men who have until then been assistant priests in other parishes and they find the Eastfield estate very disheartening as their first cure of souls. The present man is anxious to embark on an extensive scheme of visiting, but finds the running of the

organisations too distracting. Hundreds of children come to St. Richard's, but there are no people who can cope with them. The nature of the building makes it difficult to conduct Sunday worship.

The kind of worship varies enormously in the different churches, from the simplest "north-end" liturgy in the church of the Good Shepherd to an imitation of the Western Rite at St. Leo's. This variation contributes towards the divisions between the parishes.

I remain, your Holiness,

Yours angelically,

BILBO.

Note. The copy of St. Michael's reply to Bilbo's second letter is missing from the file, but the nature and extent of the archangel's recommendations can be guessed from the following extract, which has been taken from another of Bilbo's letters, written some years later when he was evidently on more informal terms with his chief. Unfortunately the extract does not reveal whether the changes at Nilborough were brought about by negotiations through the normal ecclesiastical channels, or by a miracle. The reader may doubt, however, as I do, whether such changes could in fact be accomplished without the use of some supernatural force.—J.G.

No. 4

. . . I called in at Nilborough the other day. You will be delighted to know that the Church Militant there goes on from strength to strength. The reorganisation has taken place more or less according to plan. (Shall I ever forget those tedious diocesan committees and P.C.C.s?) The old boundaries of St. Mary's have been restored, and the Good Shepherd has become a guild church. The clergy still live in their former vicarages, but now they work as one staff.

St. Leo's has been converted into a Church Centre. The sanctuary has been walled off to form a chapel—and very handy, too, for those who have to catch buses and trains—and a floor has been put in halfway up the nave, making a big assembly room downstairs and committee rooms upstairs. The vicar of the parish spends a lot of time here, lecturing in classes run in conjunction with the new college. I never did think much of the place as a church: the architecture suits its new function admirably.

Fr. Smith is chaplain of the Southwood Hospital and looks after the sick in the parish. Holy Raphael would be pleased with him! The reserved sacrament has been transferred from St. Leo's to the parish church, and the number of sick communions has multiplied many times.

I mustn't forget to mention the full-time parochial secretary and the full-time youth leader. There have been some arguments about those offices! Isn't it odd how human priests imagine that they and their kind must be the only paid officials in a parish? Such obnoxious clericalism! After the stewardship campaign they wanted to appoint *three* assistant priests, if you please! In the end, sanctity prevailed, and they appointed two laymen and only one assistant priest. The secretary is a retired civil servant. The vicar asked him the other day if he would like to be a lay reader. Do you know what he said? "My job is to run the parish, not to preach at it!" I could have cheered!

The dual-purpose on the Eastfield estate is now the youth centre. It is still used as a church on Sunday mornings until the new St. Richard's is ready. This will be a wonderful building—you know, modernly primitive, with a central altar. It will be more striking than the new school, which has been built on the site I originally suggested.

They've made the former vicar of the Good Shepherd the parish missioner. His visiting teams have joined up with the drama group from St. Leo's and they're hitting hard at the Eastfield estate. They did the stations of the cross up there on Holy Saturday and made a deep impression. The folk from St. Mary's and the Good Shepherd run all the organisations up there now, so the former priest-in-charge can visit as much as he likes.

There are eucharists at all the churches on Sunday mornings. The servers who were at St. Leo's have gone to St. Mary's and they help on the estate, so the ceremonial in those places has improved. The Good Shepherd retains its simpler service. The clergy hope one day to have a uniform rite, probably "reformed", throughout the parish, but in the meantime it's useful to have a low church to send people to whilst there's still some prejudice about. They only have evensong at the parish church.

Everybody goes to St. Mary's for an evening mass on festivals. It was Ascension Day whilst I was there, so I went up into the clerestory and joined in. The bishop came to baptise and confirm and administer first communion, and it struck me that the next step in the reorganisation of the Church Militant in Nilborough would be to consecrate the vicar of St. Mary's. Then we should be returning to those good old days when the bishop was the spiritual leader and father-in-God in every town!

Blue-Print for a Rural Deanery

Canon S. Val Green

The average rural deanery presents no pattern of ministry, but is only an amalgam of autonomous parishes, which often have no pastoral connection whatever with their next-door neighbour. The several incumbents are also often isolationist in their pastoralia, and many of them even hold aloof from chapter meetings and deanery clerical study-circles, by the very nature of the isolationist traditions of their several parishes. This lack of cohesion in the rural deanery results in a truncated ministry, and a parochialism which falls far short of what it should be in energy. Only a pattern in which all find their place, and to which all, both priest and people, contribute their particular gifts, can give that full and integrated life which a rural deanery should show forth.

The strange thing is that the rural deanery has existed so long in the Anglican Communion without its full possibilities being realised and acted upon. But it is only in recent years that the office of rural dean itself has become functional in a much wider sense than hitherto. No longer in many cases is the holder of the office an old man, worn out in his ministry and given the honour for his years of service. It is recognised by some bishops today that the office is onerous as well as honorary. This is probably because the church, being more alive than in times past, the bishops, being themselves younger men than their predecessors, realise that the office of rural dean has possibilities—but the whole thinking upon the matter is vague. It still remains for the rural dean to *make the job*. If he were to stick to the minimum laid down in his deed of appointment, then he would but repeat the story of the past.

Even these meagre duties have not always been carried out. The instruction that he carry out a visitation of the parish churches in his deanery once every three years has often not been fulfilled. One rural dean, looking back through parish registers during his first visitation, discovered that it was also the first for thirty-three years. Not all these could be blamed on the lack of

transport—the internal combustion engine has been man's help-meet for many of those years. One wonders if the vast restoration schemes, especially in ancient churches, would have been so necessary if this triennial check-up had been carried out.

The carrying out of the *bare* minimum of duties would to no extent make a rural deanery into a unity, functioning not as a conglomeration of individual parishes, but as one single family of the faithful.

First, the ruri-decanal chapter must not be limited to the twice a year suggested by Canon Law. Especially is that so in a deanery which is ruly rural, where the isolated clergy tend to be lonely folk so far as their ministry is concerned. It has been found that once a month (as in the days when the office was instituted), except in the two summer months, works very well. It is not just a business meeting, but considers from time to time matters of pastoralia, and it is always found that the agenda is sufficiently big for some matter to spill over into the following month. Occasional speakers from outside, with their specialist knowledge of some part of our work, are called in. The chapter limits itself to these matters of pastoralia, and by pooling personal experiences and problems it is found that the clergy can help each other very much.

The study-circle also meets once a month, and, helped by one of the university professors, tackles quite difficult subjects—theological—yet bearing upon our pastoral work as well. Naturally not all the clergy attend this study-circle, as not all clerics are students; whereas one hundred per cent attend the chapter, about fifty per cent attend the study-circle.

Chapter meeting and study-circle combine to do two useful offices—they make us more aware of one another, and tend to make our interests deanery rather than parochial.

Not only, however, must the clergy come together to consult and discuss, but the laity of the parishes also must have such opportunities. Of course the first way for that to happen that occurs to one is the ruri-decanal conference, but this is so often bedevilled with discussion on how the deanery quota is to be assessed that there is little time for more valuable debate on subjects of greater importance. However, to follow the conference with a social evening does give the lay representatives a chance to get to know one another, and their talk, following such a conference, tends to be about their respective parishes, their plans and their problems.

A better method, bringing more of the deanery laity together, is the deanery synod, which meets once a year. This is open to all members of P.C.C.s as well as all the clergy. It is addressed by some authority on a subject which is exercising the minds of the Church Assembly at the moment, and after the address the subject is open for discussion. So far as possible the clergy hold back in the debate which follows, thus giving the laity every opportunity of making themselves conversant with the subject. It is important that such an audience, comprised as it is of the key personnel of the parishes in the deanery, should only be addressed by one who is capable of taking full advantage of such an opportunity. For the laity concerned it is a recognition of the importance of the office they hold—the only recognition they receive. Members wear in their lapels the name of their parish, thus making a get-together easier.

Both the R.D.C. and the Deanery Synod are community efforts, and have as their objective the unifying of the deanery. This they do if used for that purpose, but as things stand in the rural deanery set-up at present, they are the only cohering instruments. A new assessment of the possibilities of a rural deanery should be made, and this will include as its foremost consideration a pattern of ministry so far as the clergy are concerned.

The rural deanery ought to reflect in microcosm the Church as a whole. To this end the sum-total of its clergy ought to epitomise *all* the various facets of her teaching and her work. Every incumbent should have a two-fold responsibility, first to his parish, and second to his deanery, contributing to both his peculiar gifts.

But here some planning must be done, and this is governed by two factors—the size of the deanery, and patronage. Many deaneries are far too large, containing up to twenty-five parishes. The ideal size is fifteen or sixteen parishes. Given this as a norm, the procedure would be to obtain a pattern of clergy that would mirror the varied activities of the Church as a whole. These would be, I should say: foreign missions, home missions, industrial chaplaincy, liaison with the medical authorities, Sunday schools, day schools, adult education, moral welfare, parochial missions, church music, a trained conductor of retreats, press representative, youth chaplain.

A deanery so staffed with men expertly experienced in their own individual specialisation, contributing to the deanery as a

whole their particular knowledge and gifts, would be presenting to the laity a picture which they could understand. The deanery would be a unity and parish boundaries a mere convention; there would be a oneness about the presentation of the faith which would be far and away more beneficial to them than the bitty and piecy presentation of it that they now receive.

However, before any such scheme of things could ever hope to materialise, something would have to be done about patronage. In some dioceses the rural dean sits in on the diocesan board of patronage whenever the vacancy concerned is in his deanery. This is a good thing, but a mere step in the right direction—a stride is necessary.

If the prospective incumbent could be considered not only for his general suitability for a paricular parish, but also for his peculiar gifts for the deanery set-up, the deanery pattern would maintain its completeness, and all the parishes have at their disposal a man of particular gifts—in turn lending their incumbent to all the other parishes for the same purpose.

Nor would one parish always have for its incumbent a returned missionary, and another a trained conductor of retreats, because, sad though it is to relate, deaneries often have as many as five or six livings vacant at the same time, and a switch could be made.

The deanery set-up, old style, is a dreary, static affair, its machinery beginning to creak, but with the adoption of a ministerial pattern such as I have tried to explain, there would be a new corporate life in the deanery, and for the laity a new vision of what the Church is and the opportunities and responsibilities that lie before her.

A Plea for the Ordination of Children

J. S. Cowan

Tradition down the ages has never countenanced the idea of child priests. But is there to be no change, no growth, no creativeness in the life of the Church? It is only prejudice, unreasoning emotion, which leads people to oppose this intrinsically sensible idea. On all sides the shortage of clergy is deplored. The ordination of children is the obvious answer to the problem.

This is not so revolutionary an idea as it may at first seem. The fact that St. Paul taught *and practised* the ordination of children has been obscured by generations of adult scholars, blinded to the truth by a state of affairs which they assumed was "natural". This may seem a bold assertion, but more than one passage bears it out.

Paul's teaching on the subject may be seen in his Epistle to the Galatians. "There can be neither bond nor free . . . in Christ Jesus. . . . So long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a bondservant." (Gal. iii. 28ff.) St. Paul's equation of bondservants with children in this famous passage enables us to see that two verses earlier he plainly intends one of his contrasts to be between *children* and freemen. Under the Christian dispensation these contrasts should cease.

St. Paul (as so often, took the lead in putting his ideas into practice. It is very probable that Timothy was a child. From his babyhood he had known the sacred writings. (II Tim. iii. 15.) He was young enough for Paul to know his grandmother, Lois (II Tim. ii. 5). Indeed, Paul actually calls him a child (II Tim. ii. 1). He exhorts him to stir up the gift of God, "which is in thee through the laying on of my hands". It is therefore indisputable that Timothy was also one of the ordained ministry. St. Paul charges him to preach the word, do the work of an evangelist, fulfil his ministry. (II Tim. iv. 2-5.)

Why then, it may be argued, was not the ordination of children more widely accepted? Leaving aside the survival in certain localities of this custom, which found expression in the token consecration of boy bishops, the chief influencing factor seems to have been sociological. Children would have had a more prominent position in the ministry of the early Church if social conditions had been better. The early Church existed in an adult-dominated society and it was only natural that in those days it should be considered expedient for children in the Church to maintain a subordinate role. This hardly applies in the twentieth century: today young people are leaders of fashion both in dress and entertainment. Who is to say that they have no role to play in the leadership of the Church?

Today children are subject to far fewer restrictions than ever before; parents are reluctant to impose discipline on them, but prefer to see the natural flowering of the child's abilities,

untrammelled by parental correction. Anyone who tries his hand at pastoral visiting soon hears a parent remark about little Johnny, lapsed from Sunday school: "I don't believe in forcing him to go. . . . Of course, when I was young I went three times every Sunday—*mother made us go.*"

This revolution in the climate of opinion naturally leads us to consider whether the artificial restriction of the priesthood to adults, still maintained as a rearguard action by the Church, is any longer defensible. The question is whether the Spirit of God has prepared the way, through the emancipation of children, for the implications of the Pauline teaching that in Christ "there is neither bond nor free" (i.e. neither *child* nor free) to be realised.

Moreover, unless we are Marcionites we shall do well to weigh such evidence on the subject as the Old Testament puts before us. The fact that Samuel and Jeremiah began their ministry when they were children should count for something as we consider how best to meet the needs of the New Israel. If it be objected that children would be reluctant to come forward, we can but remind the objector that Samuel and Jeremiah were reluctant too; indeed, Jeremiah expressly attributed his sense of inadequacy to his tender age (Jer. i. 6). But in neither case was their natural diffidence allowed to be a bar to their true vocation (I Sam. ii. 18; Jer. i. 9).

Then there is the pastoral argument. One can only effectively exercise a ministry towards a section of the community when one has had personal experience of their way of life. Admittedly the clergy were once children themselves, but this was so long ago in most cases that they have probably forgotten all about their younger days. And the children of this generation have problems their parents did not encounter. It was not without cause that St. Paul uttered the warning: "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath." (Eph. vi. 4.)

The idea of child priests would soon catch on, once the authorities had made it clear that anyone refusing their ministrations or barring them from his pulpit would be prosecuted. A boy, properly robed, would be as inconspicuous when taking services as any member of the choir. He could give his own interpretation of the Gospel; could exercise pastoral care, especially to other children, and show by his office that there is no age discrimination in the Church. Children could help in so many ways—as chaplains

in schools, specialists in conducting children's services and children's missions, to give but a few examples.

Children are not without the ability in many cases to bring home to parents and others their special insight into religious truth. The child Elihu, it will be remembered, refrained from addressing Job until his three friends had finished speaking. Being adults, they would expect the customary deference of one so "few of days" (as the Hebrew charmingly puts it). Elihu was patient, but he did not have the false modesty which many adults expect of children. "Hearken unto me," he said unto Job, "and I shall teach thee wisdom." (Job xxxii. 4, 6ff; xxxiii. 33.) This ability of children to impart spiritual truths to their seniors should not be lost sight of when we are considering the contribution they would make to the priestly life.

One serious objection remains to be considered. There are a number of people who accept that although the theological verdict might be favourable we must still refrain from ordaining children, because to take such an action would gravely prejudice the reunion of Christendom. But to understand the truth and translate it into action will not really be a hindrance to the unity of the Church. The Spirit of truth is also the Spirit of unity. Furthermore, many denominations are already on the way to accepting the principle of child ministers. The growing popularity of the Rose Queen movement in the chapels of our land is a modern parallel to the boy bishops of bygone days. The respect accorded the young Rose Queen shows that youth need be no barrier. We must work for a great united Church, truly catholic in all essentials, to which the communions now separated will bring the riches of their own inheritance. To this unification of churches all will contribute: the Anglicans will bring the child-episcopate; the Free Churches, the child-pastorate. Each will bring the fullness of its contribution into a richer whole.

Finally, let it not be said that in this age of space-ships and progress the Church is lagging behind. The nations have long had child kings and queens. For those who, in the "secular" ordering of society, find no difficulty in accepting a child in a position of the highest authority, the ordination of children is a question which deserves at least to be treated seriously. As Professor G. W. H. Lampe so rightly says in a contribution to the journal *Time and Tide* (27th April, 1961): "What is important is that the main issue should be raised above mere prejudice."

DANIEL JENKINS

Equality and Excellence

A Christian Comment on Britain's Life

21*s net*

JOHN LAWRENCE

The Hard Facts of Unity

A Layman Looks at the Ecumenical Movement

8*s* 6*d net*

GIBSON WINTER

The Suburban Captivity of the Churches

Professor Winter's investigation of the American scene has already 'sent the American Protestant Church quivering'. *Evening Standard.*

21*s net*

RAYMOND HAMMER

Japan's Religious Ferment

Christian Presence amid Faiths Old and New

15*s net*

HAROLD LOUKES

Teenage Religion

An enquiry undertaken in modern schools on behalf of the Institute of Christian Education.

8*s* 6*d net*

GUSTAF AULEN

The Faith of the Christian Church

Revised and enlarged edition

40*s net*

SCM PRESS

Memorandum

[Submitted to the Moderator of The Central Advisory Council for the Ministry by Lt.-Col. H. E. Madge]

I. INTRODUCTION:

In providing a Ministry for the people of England, the Church of England is faced with the two urgent and connected problems of the payment and the deployment of the clergy. The two are connected because you cannot deploy the available clergy where they are needed unless there is adequate remuneration available for them, and money which is tied to a particular place is unproductive if there is no one available for that place. Neither of these is a new problem, but the social and economic circumstances have changed so greatly in the last 50 years that the old ways by which the provision was made, designed originally for a predominantly rural country, are no longer able to meet them, despite attempts to adapt them.

Each of these two problems is composed of several facets. The payment of the clergy must include not only adequate remuneration, comparable to that of other similar vocations, but also the administration, use and disposal of endowments both real and personal, and the provisions for accommodation, expenses of office and of transport, pensions on retirement, and pensions for widows and dependants. Similarly, deployment must include not only the licensing of curates and appointment of incumbents, but the whole question of pastoral organisation, including the size and number of dioceses, the effective pastoral unit and the most effective form of ministry for it, the extent to which movement of clergy shall be wihin the power of the episcopate, the rights of patronage, the age of retirement from responsibility, and the methods by which and extent to which retired clergy may continue to exercise their ministry. There are, moreover, other problems less directly related, such as the appointment of Bishops on the one hand, and the redundancy of churches on the other, which have a bearing on these matters.

Attempts have in the past been made to solve some of these problems in isolation or in part, but none of these has been successful, because they are all closely connected, inter-twined and inter-independent, and because they are all bound up with the present legal position of the clergy and of benefice property, real and personal. Indeed, the results of the Measures passed in these attempts have in the long run only caused more anomalies and even absurdities, even though for a short while they may have seemed to meet the immediate need. It is the purpose of this memorandum to review the facts of the present position in relation to these two major problems and to draw attention to the anomalies and absurdities which exist.

II. The present situation in regard to payment of the clergy:

1. *Minimum Incomes*:

All dioceses now ensure that a certain minimum income is given to the incumbent of every benefice and to assistant clergy, BUT:—

(a) The "minimum assured" varies in different dioceses;

(b) The method of assessing the "benefice income" varies in different dioceses;

(c) In some dioceses children's and other special allowances are assured in addition to the "minimum" or are given as grants in addition to the benefice income whatever its amount, or up to a certain maximum; in others no such allowances are given;

(d) In the vast majority of benefices these minimum standards are considerably greater than the actual income available, so that there is no longer any purpose to be served by individual benefice endowments.

(e) Neither the endowments nor the minimum incomes assured bear any realistic relation to the responsibility and circumstances of the cure.

2. *Union of Benefices*:

At various times during the last 60 years, union schemes have been made by which diversions and appropriations of endowments were made which left the united benefice with an income which at the time of the union appeared to be adequate. In the majority of such unions the income left is now below present minimums, so that the absurd position now exists in which statutory diversions to the Diocesan Stipends Fund or the Commissioners General Funds have now to be redirected to the same benefices by the Diocesan Authority from the same Diocesan Stipends Fund in the form of augmentation grants. Frequently in this process the parishioners have to be asked to contribute to this augmentation and not unnaturally object on the grounds that their endowments had been "stolen" previously in the union scheme.

3. *Injustices between Parishes:*

In industrial areas there are numbers of benefices of very large populations with practically no endowment income. At the other extreme there are still quite a number of benefices, often already united benefices, with quite considerable endowments, but in which the total population is no more than five or six hundred.

Of two benefices of similar size and with equally small endowments, it may well be that in one of them the parishioners are already accepting full responsibility for the provision of an adequate stipend, but in the other they may be doing nothing about it all all, so that the diocesan authority has to provide heavy grants to maintain a still inadequate minimum. Thus it is often the case that the incumbent with the greatest and most exacting task is the one who receives the least remuneration. The parish in which the people have the least sense of responsibility towards their clergy often receives the greatest financial help from the diocesan authorities. Moreover, this cannot be remedied owing to the Church Commissioners insistence that once a grant has been made from their allocations to the Diocesan Stipends Fund it may not subsequently be reduced. Thus it seems that the size of the incumbent's stipend varies inversely with the burden of the responsibilities and difficulties of the incumbent's task and that

the amount of financial help given by the diocese varies inversely with the extent to which the parishioners are shouldering their responsibilities.

4. *Stipend Policy*:

From the conditions laid down by the Church Commissioners in regard to the use of the allocations made to dioceses and their efforts to encourage parochial benefactions, the whole policy appears still to be based on the assumption that the Church of England will one day again be fully endowed parochially. This seems to be quite unrealistic in view of the redistribution of wealth in the country. Apart from this it is difficult to discern that there is any policy, nor indeed can there be, so long as the present chaotic system exists. The existing anomalies and injustices can only be prevented by breaking away from a system of tied endowments and by providing adequate central funds, distributed fairly between dioceses, from which all clergy can be given a proper scale of salaries with increments and allowances which bear a just relationship to their age and experience, their family circumstances, the nature of their particular cure or task and their capabilities. Such scale of salaries should be decided by each diocese for its own clergy, but within certain limits which are the same for all dioceses.

Such a system would, of course, necessitate the pooling at the centre of all endowments for the benefit of the Church as a whole, and their distribution fairly to dioceses. The total would still be far below the sum required and so would have to be supplemented within each diocese by a sum apportioned amongst all parishes.

Encouragement should be given to the laity to leave legacies, but the biggest inducements should be given for legacies to be left to the Central Fund, and less inducement if left to Diocesan Funds, while legacies for individual benefices or parishes should be refused.

One of the strongest arguments for such a policy is that only in this way now can the incumbent be assured of a stipend which is not dependent upon the goodwill or the whim of his parishioners.

5. *Retirement and Pensions*:

With present stipend levels clergy are not able to save for their retirement or make adequate provision for their widows and dependants in case of untimely death. Indeed, those who may have had any private means will probably have had to draw upon it to such an extent during their actual ministry that it will have dwindled to nothing by the time they reach retiring age. Hence, they are unable to retire and go on remaining in their benefices long after they have ceased to be physically, or maybe mentally, capable of bearing the responsibilities and carrying out the full duties of an incumbency. This is fair neither to them nor to the people to whom they minister. If they do retire or if they break-down or die as a result of the strain of a devoted and lonely ministry in parishes which need the service of several men, they are condemned to live in penury or their dependants are left in desperate straits.

Thus the salaries provided for clergy should be sufficient to enable them to make provision for their retirement and for their dependants in case of untimely death, and a scale of pensions should be provided which will encourage retirement at a reasonable age from the responsibilities of an incumbency, but allow them to continue to exercise their ministry as part-time assistant priests in suitable circumstances.

III. The present situation in regard to deployment:

1. The deployment of the ordained ministry is still based on a parochial system which is fundamentally the same as it was centuries ago in an England which was predominantly rural. In consequence, out of some 12,000 livings in the two Provinces of Canterbury and York, there are about 1,650 in which the total population is less than 500 persons, and nearly 2,300 more in which it does not reach 1,000. Yet ministering to these there were 3,565 clergy in 1958. Even if the average populations of these two groups are taken to be as much as 400 and 900 respectively, this means that the average number of persons to each priest is only about 245. How can it be said that there is a full-time job for each of these priests!

2. The policy of uniting benefices so that one incumbent has a cure of two, three or four small parishes each with its own parish church has not proved any solution to the problem. Indeed, it has only placed upon him the impossible duty of saying the statutory services every Sunday in a number of churches and of preaching more sermons in a day than it is possible for him adequately to prepare. In consequence he is compelled to rush from church to church for hurriedly conducted services, and these for only a handful of persons in each church who are so selfishly inconsiderate of him and so parochially minded as to refuse to attend any other church but that in their own village. This can only be done to the detriment of the general pastoral care of his people and offers no opportunity for him to lead his people into a wider and more truly Christian fellowship with the sister parishes of the union. The inevitable irregularity of the times at which services are said in each church, consequent upon the necessity to ring the changes between them, still further militates against the attendance of many of the parishioners who say they never know what service is to be held where and when. Yet there is no incentive to encourage people of all the parishes to join a service together in one or other of the churches each week, so that they might be led to a better understanding of corporate worship and Christian fellowship.

Such groupings are too large for a satisfactory ministry by one man and too small to justify the employment of a colleague, even if the manpower situation should permit. In consequence, the lonely incumbent feels frustrated and isolated without the spiritual comfort and encouragement obtained by working together with colleagues. Such a situation is therefore harmful to the spiritual life of clergy and laity alike.

3. At the other extreme there are in the industrial towns about 920 livings with populations of over 10,000 and another 110 with over 20,000 persons to which there were only about 1,860 clergy ministering in 1958. Such is the shortage of clergy in these areas that the average number of persons to each clergyman is therefore at least 6,000 and in many of these areas an incumbent is in fact trying to minister single-handed to such numbers. The impression that a priest can make on such a task is so imperceptible that many become hopelessly discouraged or breakdown under the strain.

4. Under the present system there is no means by which it can

be ensured that the ablest and best priests shall go to the places where men of their qualities are most needed. Attempts are made to get over this by the policy of placing elderly men into rural benefices in order that the younger men shall be in the large industrial parishes. This however nearly always means that the elderly priest has to be placed in a united benefice where he is even less likely than a younger man to be able to exercise an effectual ministry. Or else he is placed in one of the smallest single parish benefices and so, for the provision of a stipend for him, funds must be used which could be more effectively used in providing assistance to the young incumbent in the large industrial parish, who is likely to be prematurely worn down for lack of such assistance.

Moreover, once these elderly men have been instituted to these rural parishes, because they cannot afford to retire, they are likely to remain there until they are quite incapable, for it is practically impossible for them to be moved, and so any further pastoral re-organisation is prevented.

5. Side by side with the large modern industrial towns with their desperate need for more clergy, lie the smaller ancient cathedral cities with their superfluity of churches and disproportionate number of clergy. To take but one example, in the cathedral city of X, there are within a radius of $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the Cathedral 18 churches and four chapels for whom there are, for a total population of about 36,200 souls:—

12 incumbents
3 full-time curates
4 part-time curates
1 Dean
2 Asst. or Suffragan Bishops } for the Cathedral
4 Residential or Minor Canons }
6 Chaplains (1 Teachers' Training College, 3 Public School, 1 Prison, 1 Almshouse)

32 Total, and in addition about 15 retired clergy with permission to officiate.

6. Thus the present deployment of the available ordained man-power of the Church is ineffective, immobile, inflexible, uneconomic and largely frustrated, for it is still based upon

conditions and assumptions of centuries ago which are no longer applicable to the present day.

IV. Principles for a solution:

What then ought the Church to be doing about this? What principles are there upon which an ultimate solution should be based? I suggest that the following are at least some of the most important:—

1. The remuneration of the clergy must be adequate and secure, related fairly to their experience, responsibilities, efficiency and their circumstances, and be such as shall enable them to make provision for their retirement and their dependants. The pension arrangements also must be such as to encourage them to retire from active and responsible ministry at a reasonable age.

2. Reasonable power of manoeuvre must be given to the episcopate, so that the available man-power can be re-deployed to the best advantage when desirable and not be hampered by waiting for "dead men's shoes." At the same time, the active and effectual clergy must be reasonably secured against unjustifiable movement and their reasonable independence of conscience assured.

3. The Pastoral or Administrative framework of the Church must be thought out anew so that there may be a re-grouping of parishes and personnel which is based on more satisfactory pastoral units and efficient team work. This may well require experiments in group ministries in both town and country, and even a re-examination of the present diocesan areas and organisation.

4. The place and function of Cathedrals and their Chapters in their several localities must be thought out anew and be incorporated into the pastoral framework around them.

5. A distinction needs to be drawn between the responsible pastoral ministry of the active priest and the sacramental ministry of a priest which may be continued for many years after retirement from the former. Once this has been done the latter can be usefully fitted into the new pastoral framework to assist the teams of active clergy responsible for an area.

6. The manner in which Orders other than Bishops and Priests may be more effectively used in the Church must be thought out. The re-instatement of the diaconate to its original function in the early church may well solve many of the problems. The greater employment full-time of lay men in administrative posts, parallel and complementary to the higher pastoral appointments, might well enable the pastoral ministry to be more effectual.

V. Conclusion:

It is perfectly clear that to find a proper solution to these two great problems and all their subsidiary facets there must be a wide re-consideration of matters which are at present outside the terms of reference of C.A.C.T.M., such as Redundant Churches, Parsonage Houses and Glebe, Benefice Endowments, Patronage and even the appointment of Bishops and Synodical Government. Without this no permanent or satisfactory solution can be found. It was on the understanding that this difficulty was realised and that it could and would be overcome by co-operative study of all these matters, that I accepted the amendment to my motion in July 1960 that the work should be done by C.A.C.T.M. instead of by a special commission. It is also clear that any solution which is to be satisfactory and permanent must entail some modification of what is commonly, if inaccurately, known as "the parson's freehold," in so much as some means of pooling present resources from endowments real and personal must be found, but I am as anxious as the clergy themselves that they should retain all reasonable security, both of tenure of their office and of freedom of conscience. I am not only convinced that the initial move for such legislation as will be necessary for this purpose must come from the House of Clergy itself, but I am confident also that if the *whole* picture can be clearly shown to them, the clergy will themselves perceive how necessary it is to enable our Church to go forward bravely into the future.

Comment

I suppose it is too much to hope for that the hierarchy should cease to niggle away over things like licensing hours but it is surely not unreasonable to expect that they might get their theology right. A Bishop in a recent debate in the House of Lords, dealing with whether various Christian occasions were "Sundays" or "weekdays" for the purposes of licensing, was quoted as saying that "Christmas Day, Good Friday and Easter Day were all three of a piece and he did not see how they could be separated."

It is surely worth pointing out that Good Friday is a fast and Easter Day and Christmas Day are feast days, which makes it extremely easy to separate them. With regard to the first, there is a case for shorter licensing hours; with regard to the last two the hierarchy would be better employed petitioning the Government to see that the fountains flow with wine all day in honour of these great events.

R.D. writes:

The Church may or may not get the press it deserves, but does it really deserve the tininess of the Sunday newspaper coverage of its activities. Take the three posh ones on August Bank Holiday. The newest and most expertly orientated to the public is the *Sunday Telegraph*: here normally to be found squeezed between Travel and Gardening is an article about the Churches, usually objective and dull, sometimes critical and interesting. But on this Sunday—and since there is a serious advertising recession in Fleet Street the less essential features have to go—although Travel and Gardening were not forgotten, there was no article on the Churches and no indication anywhere in the papers that Religion was still indulged in by probably 35,000 of its 700,000 readers (5 per cent). The *Sunday Times* is quite clearly only concerned with Roman Catholicism, usually the insular and anti-ecumenical activities of the English hierarchy. Sure enough, a whisper that Cardinal Godfrey might be translated to Rome to fill one of the gaps caused by recent deaths amongst cardinals was linked to a forecast that Dr. Heenan would get his job: he was a friend of the Archbishop of Canterbury and had even appeared on TV with him—can ecumenical co-operation get any

further than that? The *Observer,* which has recently taken some interest in the Churches and has a correspondent from the Free Churches—Cecil Northcott—gave us a short column. Also to be found dotted around the latter two papers are sermonettes by distinguished preachers of various denominations, but much though one admires their authors they are usually very difficult to read. We all know the appalling statistics of church attendance but quite a significant proportion of the readership of these papers must go to Church, at least sometimes, and might therefore be thought to have some interest in religious matters. Or not?

Henry Burgess writes:

I am sure most Church people are continually asking themselves how they may touch those who have lost contact with the worshipping fellowship, or indeed have had little contact with it at all. Very often we are anxious just to get people to church. However admirable, we fail to do this, and in many cases, even if we get them there, they soon lapse again, because we have not really met their need, nor made them aware of what it all means. Should we try first to meet them at some "in-between place", on neutral ground? Is this the place to start trying to get them to understand something of the meaning of the Christian Faith and the Way of Worship, etc? In this day and generation are we being called to reach out to these people and instruct them in the meaning of worship and prayer, and the great truths of our faith, *before* bringing them to worship with the converted? In the early days Enquirers were not brought into the worship of the Church until they had been instructed and had accepted Jesus as their Saviour. Even then, no Catechumen was allowed to remain for the Mass of the Faithful until he had been fully instructed and baptised.

Some two or three years ago I was on duty for a few hours at the Diocesan Stall at the Ideal Home Exhibition. We had this stall to boost the Bishop's Appeal. I was amazed at the many people who came in and asked questions about the Church, and advice for their problems. They were not all cranks. Is the time ripe for every diocese, and eventually every town, literally to have a shop in the market place, where a Saint with both feet on the ground, will be available to answer enquirers? I am sure we need to have a spiritual person because then they will be able to catch something from him. "They took knowledge of them that they had been with

Jesus." It is most necessary that great care be exercised over the choice of the right person. Here is a place where the Ministry of the Laity can be exercised. The person chosen must be, before all else, a man of prayer, and one who loves his fellow men and able to understand their problems, and to be understood by them.

The background to such a centre must be a Prayer Group, which is also a fellowship, capable, if necessary, of receiving enquirers into its midst and also of supporting the centre with its prayers. I am thinking now of the possibilities of such a centre being attached a to some city church. There will be some people who can be sent back to their parishes, but others who for various reasons cannot. These latter could eventually find their place among the members of the city church. Again, the value of such a place, which very often would probably be a guild church, is that services can be held here during the lunch hour, etc., and if necessary these could be of an experimental nature, e.g. a Conducted Eucharist. I don't wish to discuss the virtues or the drawback of any particular service, but I must say from personal experience in two very different types of parish, that a Conducted Eucharist has done more than anything else to bring outsiders into the fellowship and to help them to learn to pray. Conducted services, and others, where people are taught and shown how to pray, in a simple way, will be a very necessary background to a success of such a centre.

We must be prepared, if such centres could be opened, for little visible success for a very long time, until the public have got used to the idea of using such places.

Edward Salmon writes:

Weymouth in August blows up like a toad, the boarding houses have "no vacancies" and the town spreads in a rash of tents and caravans engulfing the nearest villages. Preston is one of those caught by this tourist tide. Its church commands a fine view of Weymouth Bay and what must be one of the largest caravan camps in the country. The church is immaculately kept and the garden that lines the path from lych-gate to porch is a blaze of colour and an example to many. The Rector holds a special campers' service, but many of them overflow into matins at 11 a.m. I listened to my first Dorset sermon at this morning service on Bank Holiday Sunday. The former chaplain of Weymouth College, retired and living in the area, preached to a large and varied congregation about

the transfiguration. It was a model of religious instruction, illuminating and stimulating, making us see the deep significance of this strange event in our Lord's life. I feel sure his plea to us to re-read the chapters of the gospels which refer to it will not have gone unheeded.

I heard my second sermon that day on the sands at Weymouth. One normally associates the word "mission" with tin tabernacles or perhaps good works in the East End, but here in Weymouth the Rural Dean had organised a sands mission for the height of the holiday season. The Bishop of Sherbourne and the Bishop of Salisbury preached the opening and closing addresses. The Rector of Preston had exhorted us to support the final service so I went along to see what impact an establishment figure of the Church had on the holiday-making masses.

The spectacle was impressive enough, the tall commanding figure of the Bishop carrying a simple shepherd's crook attended by three servers. A bevy of clergy and a colourful assembly of local choirs received instrumental reinforcement from the Salvation Army Band. A congregation of many hundreds stood on the promenade above and craned for a better view, their ears assaulted by the shouts of local bloods and their noses by the smell of fried onions. They listened attentively to a sonorous voice delivering a rambling discourse nearly half an hour long. I wonder what they thought. The Bishop embraced the whole range of Christian belief from the Creation to the Cross, but the effect was neither religious instruction nor exhortation, the other definition which the dictionary gives to the word sermon. The supporters from the local churches no doubt followed what it all meant, but a sermon which included quotations from the Greek and the story of the ride of Roland from Ghent to Aix (popular reading for bingo players?) will not get the holiday-makers off the promenades and into the churches where they belong.

An opportunity had been missed. Where was the appeal which would catch the imagination of those, the inquisitive, who just stopped to see what all the fuss was about, where was the challenge to those whose worship is a distant memory? or to those who having "never had it so good" materially have never thought that there may be moral and spiritual rewards equally worthwhile achieving? The Sands Mission on this occasion at least, had gone wide of the target area.

Letters

SOCIOLOGY

Dear Sir,

Since you delegated to me responsibility for assembling the articles on Christian sociology (*Prism*, June), may I comment on the two letters from Mr. Buck and Lord March.

1. "Christian sociology" has value as a descriptive title. Mr. Reckitt and Mr. Mairet and their circle considered that they were there to do just that. At the beginning of my own article I made the distinction between "Christian sociology"—meaning the way in which the Christendom group and others have tried to bring theology to bear on the study of society—and "academic sociology"—meaning the discipline that 85 dons in this country now get paid for practising. Lord March may not like the former term, but its practitioners used it, and to disdain it is arrogant and unhelpful.

2. Your correspondents are perfectly right to discriminate between "Christian sociology" and "religious sociology"—the stuff of Argyle's and Bouchard's books. But the June *Prism* wasn't about that, and anyone who took its cover seriously (for which, as you know, sir, I was not responsible) and then wants to complain because the number was mainly about other things, cannot see a joke when it stares him in the face.

To sum up, while I cannot speak for my fellow-members of the editorial board, I should have hoped *Prism's* sociology number made our attitude quite plain:

a. We applaud what sociology discovers, while questioning its wilder claims.

b. In particular we can see the value of having some religious sociology done in England.

c. Sociology's vaunted separation of fact and value is meaningless, since whoever does a sociological survey must (like an experimenting scientist) begin from certain assumptions; consequently there is still room for—and what need for!—more of what used properly to be called "Christian sociology".

Yours, very truly,

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN.

London, S.W.3.

Dear Sir,

Neither Maurice Reckitt nor Philip Mairet get down to the real issues. On the one hand you have an establishment representing which the Bishop of Leicester can say: "One knows what a Christian society would be like, what we don't know is what a Christian should advocate for a non-Christian society", a heretical concept only comparable to the previous Bishop of Norwich: "against an un-Christian people one must use un-Christian methods". (A pity Christ hadn't known?) On the other you have the bulk of Christian Socialists still using the words of Common Ownership as a road to human brotherhood, while advocating support for Labour Party Rationalisation that nowhere brought equality, for Labour Party Colonial rule, despite the fact that in Central Africa, Malaya, Cyprus, Ghana and elsewhere the Labour Government has an even worse record than the Tories, and which still equates Labour Internationalism and World Peace, despite the bombing of Hiroshima after Japan's surrender and the fact that the Labour Government first made British Nuclear Weapons.

Faced with the total lack of constructive Christian thought (and in a totally amoral society like our own each thought would be by definition revolutionary) what have Mairet and Reckitt to offer other than the fact that the tradition of F. D. Maurice is in the doldrums largely because it has succeeded. Reckitt, it is true, says words about the inadequate philosophical and theological content of "Christian Action" while Mairet reminds us that Christian Socialists did in the past advocate policies that conflicted with Fabianism even though they were "not dogmatic" and didn't press the opposition. (It is of course this precisely that is the rub. Had the Christian Socialists remained true to their own lights; had they insisted that Socialism involves devolution, equality, workers control, an end to the conveyor belt forms of production, collective contracts; had they demanded a socialism more concerned with to what a man feels he belongs to than what he owns; a socialism that fulfils man's individuality and his holiness, not turns him into a part of a machine; had in fact they taken their place among the Libertarian currents of Socialism in opposition to the Labour Party; had they indeed renounced Maurice and all his works; we would not now be in the parlous state we are.)

Therefore sir I beg you to follow up this issue with a further one examining the part of Christian Socialist thought and practice

and the incredible divergence in these. (The distributionists it is true rebelled against the centralising tradition only to turn to Mediaevalism and justify another form of Centralism.) But for most Christian Socialists there was an unnatural gulf between theory and practice coupled with a similar gulf between their theology and their social philosophy. (Except of course Conrad Noel and Stuart Headlam whose theology jolted their political views though not always their political acts.)

Yours faithfully,

?.....

57 Ladbroke Grove,
W.11.

(*We regret we can't read the signature.*—ED.)

SCIENCE

Dear Sir,

Your contributor R. M. Appleby canters blithely through a large number of highly problematical issues, any one of which would merit an article to itself; but some of his assertions ought not to be allowed to pass without comment.

(*a*) By "Flesh" St. Paul means something quite different from "our mechanistic animal natures"; St. Paul certainly would *not* say that our inheritance from Adam is simply via the Flesh (there is no mention of flesh in the passage cited from Romans 5); by "One Flesh" he indicates some psychic or possibly metaphysical unity established between a man and woman through the act of coition and has no reference at that point to our common solidarity in Adam. A brief reference to any modern exegesis of the terms in question (e.g. *Theological Word Book of the Bible*—Richardson) would reveal that σαρς is in fact one aspect of the total psychosomatic unity of man, not a department of it.

(*b*) Surely de Chardin regarded the universe not as "entirely non-miraculous" but as totally miraculous—so it seems at least from *Le Milieu Divin*, which is to my mind a far more important and profound book than *The Phenomenon of Man*.

(*c*) Most important of all it seems both philosophically scandalous and theologically dangerous to attempt, as Mr. Appleby does, to insert *into* the process of evolution of the species any "miraculous control". The issue can be most clearly put by asking—If it were

possible to analyse exhaustively the antecedent causes of any particular step in the evolution of *Homo sapiens*—say a genetic mutation—would one expect to end up with a small residuum of effects for which natural causes could not be found and which could therefore be attributed to "miraculous control"? If this is what Mr. Appleby is asking for, I think the answer must be an emphatic NO.

The processes of evolution are to be described on two different though related levels, one scientific, the other that of faith. The scientist on his level *must* assert the *total* sufficiency of natural causation—so that the more or less haphazard selection of random variations is in the case of evolution the total science-level description of the method by which the process advances. Faith on the other hand believes that chance mutations are providentially provided and providentially selected, but at no time must Providence be allowed to become one of the terms causally involved in the process—Providence is not a cause, it is (adjectivally) the faith-description of certain causal processes. The fact that this particular blip of cosmic radiation lands on that particular gene and induces a mutation is no less a miracle for the fact that its origin is in principle determinable.

(*d*) What would Mr. Appleby say to the Augustinian definition of free will I wonder?

Yours faithfully,

HUGH DICKINSON.

Trinity College,
Cambridge.

Dear Sir,

I should be grateful if you would publish a letter *a propos* my article on "Biochemistry, other Worlds and Christian Doctrine". Unfortunately, I have allowed you to copy it from an unamended and uncorrected typescript.

(1) On p. 11, in the third paragraph, there is a serious omission. To show the proper sense, most of the paragraph had better be given in full:

> There have been many different meanings to the word "soul" and its equivalents. To some it means an immaterial substance dominating a material substance. To Aristotle it is the nerve form of the body and cannot exist apart from the body. To St. Thomas

Aquinas it is the form of the body, which can, however, exist apart from the body, whereas the body cannot exist apart from the soul (the form of a dead body being a new form which takes the place of the soul as the soul leaves the body). It is plain that these views do not all come to the same thing.

At the end of the paragraph, read "relation" for "creation".

(2) On p. 12, l. 25, read "constitutions" for "contributions".

(3) It has been pointed out to me that I have used the term "hypostatic union" incorrectly. This, properly, refers only to the union of the two Natures in the Person of Christ. On p. 14, therefore, ll. 6 and 7 should read:

(*d*) the work of Christ as man effects all that is necessary, without their nature being hypostatically united to his divine Nature.

In l. 8, delete "hypostatically".

In l. 31, delete "hypostatic".

(4) On p. 16, in l. 18, there are two misprints, but I wish in any case to express the statement slightly differently:

Genesis, chap. 2 v. 4 is understood to represent the creation of the world within the Second Person of the Trinity as its *locus*, . . .

(5) The first book referred to in footnote 1 is, of course, called *Nicholas of Cusa.*

(6) There are several misprints in footnote 11:

Rupert of Deutz, . . . John Wessel, Picus of Mirandola, Giacomo Nachianti, . . .

Westcott's book is, of course, *The Epistles of St. John.*

It has also been suggested to me that my discussion of the philosophy of forms (pp. 12 and 13) is unsatisfactory. But I think that this is only so because, up to now, all discussion of the philosophy of forms has been unsatisfactory: a form has to be at one and the same time both a logical abstraction and a metaphysical entity, and no one has yet shown how to provide for this.

Perhaps I may also add that I had not read any of Teilhard de Chaudin when I wrote this article, though there are similar concerns at some points. But I now think that Teilhard is more interesting for what he attempted than successful in what he achieved.

Yours, etc.,

DUNSTAN JONES, C.R.

W.11.

FAITH AND ORDER

Dear Sir,

Mr. Cracknell is quite mistaken in thinking that Anglicans do not believe that Our Lord founded a Church, *the* Church. What we see no reason to believe is that "it must follow, as the night the day" that the Church of Rome is *the* Church.

Archbishop Temple is supposed to have said, "I believe in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, but regret very much that it does not at present exist." This dictum is referred to in a useful article by Don Cupitt entitled "What do we mean by 'the Church'?," in *Theology* this month.

No: we are entitled to examine the articles in Rome's credal cupboard one by one. It makes no difference sticking a label on the cupboard door which reads, "Everything in this cupboard follows automatically from Acts 8: 26-39." You can't make a doctrine true by a wave of a Papal magic wand.

Somewhere Bishop Stephen Neill has described a conversation between an "Anglican" and a "Roman" about the development of doctrine which went something like this:

Roman. "The Church is like a great oak tree which has grown from an acorn."

Anglican. "Well, in that case, why are there beech-nuts growing on it?"

Roman. "You're wrong. They're acorns."

Anglican. "I'm sorry, but they still look like beech-nuts to me."

And so the debate continues. Mr. Bryan is quite right: A "confession of imperfection" on the part of Rome is called for.

Yours sincerely,

Doncaster. JOHN W. KENNEDY.

CHRISTMAS CARDS

Dear Sir,

The first of a dreary series of Christmas cards arrived this morning. Various organisations hope that we will buy these to help their funds. This card is bright, the only point in its favour, but sweet, sticky and second-hand in its sentimentality. It only lacks an improving verse by Mrs. Alexander. Soon will arrive cards which sternly profess the faith of Christ crucified, almost irrelevant to Christmas. Dare we send either of these cards to our pagan friends who believe in a certain integrity in art?

There is some excellent commercial art these days. Do we have to put up with second-rate pastiche? The same criticisms can be made of the majority of secular cards, but there are also some good ones. We need cards which proclaim the festival of the Incarnation, honest cards by Churchmen who know what Christmas is about.

I write in the hope that somewhere among your readers you have a Prismatic artist.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE BRAUND.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

GENESIS

Dear Sir,

May I resolve Mr. Tennant's doubt whether I believe the first chapters of Genesis to be historical or mythological?

A narrative may be symbolical (I prefer this word to "mythological") in either of two senses: (1) it may use symbolic language to bring out the inner meaning of an actual historical event, (2) it may describe as a historical event some idea or set of ideas which was not a historical event at all. Thus, the account of the Ascension in Acts would be symbolical in sense (1) to someone who believed that on the Mount of Olives Christ's human nature received its final and definitive liberation from the restrictions of spatial existence and physical law, although his body did not simply travel outwards along the radius of the earth at Jerusalem into a mass of fluorescent vapour; it would be symbolical in sense (2) to someone who believed that Christ and the Apostles never went up to the Mount of Olives at all but that the whole story was fabricated in order to give vivid literary expression to the fact of Christ's moral authority over his followers. I believe that the story of the Fall in Genesis is symbolical in sense (1); that is to say, that what it is concerned to tell us about is the first human sin, although some or all of the physical details (and which these are it is not very easy to know) are not to be taken literally. Of course, since all human sins have a great deal in common, the story may *also* be taken as a symbol of other human sins than the first. The people I find it very difficult to follow are those who say that the narrative is not a symbolical description of the first human sin but of human sin as such, for it is a matter of logic that what is true of all the members of a class distributively is true of each of them. There is, however, a peculiar significance in the first human

sin; it may or may not have been worse than subsequent ones, but it is the one that started the rot.

I have dealt above with the Fall, as I think it is the element of the Genesis story with which Mr. Tennant was mainly concerned. The other elements—the creation of the world, of man and of woman for example—would need separate discussion to decide which features of them are symbolical and in which sense. But I think the broad distinction between the two senses of symbol is simple and important and that, by and large, the Biblical narratives are symbolical in the former of them. For the whole essence of Biblical religion and of the Christian Faith is that they are concerned with what God and man have *done*. It is of the essence of the Gospel that man has been made by God, has rebelled against him, and has been redeemed by him in Christ, not that man is a complex psychological specimen manifesting elements of dependence, guilt-consciousness and liberation. It is here that the distinction lies between Christianity and gnosticism, whether in its first-century or its twentieth-century forms. Not, of course, that I believe Fr. Tennant to be a gnostic!

Yours sincerely,

Christ Church, Oxford. E. L. Mascall.

"ADAM, WHERE ART THOU?"

Dear Sir,

My piece published in your August issue was written many months ago. If no one else has yet written to say so, I must say myself that I now think it to be largely mistaken. At that time I still thought that there could be such a thing as "theology", and that it should be brought into harmony with other branches of science and engineering. Since then I have been paying more attention to Judaism, and I think the one important thing that Christians have to learn from Judaism is that theology is impermissible—"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain".

There have been a few hellenised Jews who dabbled in theology, but the mainstream has rejected it, as they have rejected creeds and dogmas, and in this I believe them to be more "Christian" than the Christians, for surely there is something wrong if our dialogue with God is less personal and passionate than theirs? God can be praised, questioned, reviled, even joked with, but he cannot be spoken about as the subject of propositional statements; he can only be spoken of, if at all, in poetry and prophecy.

Jesus was never presented with a theologian "caught in the very act". If He had been, I do not think He would have wished him to be stoned, any more than the adulteress, but I think he would have said just as firmly, "Go, and sin no more".

I think my mistaken attitude also led me to misunderstand, and underestimate, the quality and depth of Genesis as poetry.

Yours faithfully,

Korea. ROGER TENNANT.

M.U.

(*ref Comment Prism August*)

Dear Sir,

Please don't disaffiliate.

Divisions in the Church in the past were often caused by people refusing to conform instead of remaining in obedience and working for reform.

A hippopotaminimus can't get away from the fact that his mother is a hippopotamus.

Prism could be quite a help.

Yours faithfully,

LYDIA R. DAWS.

Kingswood, Surrey.

CORRECTION

Dear Sir,

I suspect that you have a Congregationalist among your type-setters who has an accomplice among your proof readers. I wrote "By his (Ignatius) evidence mon-episcopacy is the norm by 116 A.D."—but it came out as "*non*-episcopacy!" (In fact, this was doubtless due to my handwriting, as was the mistranslation of Ελλοχῖμοι, which should read "on an account" not "on our account").

Yours sincerely,

Sunderland. T. J. TOWERS.

POEMS

Dear Sir,

Re your reply to Miss Hinch. Why?

Yours faithfully,

Sheffield. J. MATTHEWS.

(*Some people like them. Ed.*)

Reviews

EXPLORING PARISH CHURCHES, by *Victor Bonham-Carter*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. 25s.

The modest title of this book scarcely does justice to the range of Mr. Bonham-Carter's subject. His non-antiquarian approach makes a welcome change in this much over-written field. He treats architecture in its contemporary social and religious setting, tracing the evolution and growth of the English parish church as much in terms of the changing liturgy and ways of worship as of the development of styles of building. Technical details about such fittings and ornaments are relegated to an extended illustrated index, and as a result the church is allowed to appear as something living and organic rather than as a museum full of semi-sacrosanct stoups, screens and low-side windows.

It is disappointing to find that the book has already been criticised in one weekly just because it is not the familiar glorified catalogue that the majority of church explorers expect, and omits gargoyles, graffiti, and one or two of the other ecclesiastical appurtenances.

He takes as his theme the interaction between two main plans, the auditory church, which is in essence a single undivided room designed for preaching, and the elongated church composed of compartments of bays, emphasing the apartness of the priest. His study is brought up to date with a consideration of church building since, 1900 and his conclusions about the necessity for really modern building are made the more forcibly since they emerge so clearly from the historical survey that precedes them. Good architecture reflects the worshipping needs of contemporary society; bad architecture fails because it starts from the premise that one particular style is more "Christian" than the other. The Church's understanding of itself in the twentieth century transcends both the compartmental and the auditory plans, since, while the altar must be the focus of the building, the congregation, as the Body of Christ have their part to play, and must therefore be so placed that they may participate fully.

ESTHER DE WAAL.

SECTS AND SOCIETY by *Bryan R. Wilson.* Published by Heinemann 35s.

An absolutely first-class sociological study of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Church, Christian Science and the Christadelphians, giving their teaching, history, organisation and social composition. Let us hope that this series "Heinemann Books on Sociology" will go even more extensively into the religious field.

A MAN DIES, by *Ewan Hooper* and *Ernest Marvin.* Published by A.B.C. Weekend Television. 1s.
(With 45 r.p.m. gramophone record. 6/4d.)

It was a very good idea of A.B.C. to publish the script together with a record of their Rock'n'Roll Passion Play. Reading it confirms the impression of the original production that in spite of obvious weaknesses, this is the kind of thing which Christian Drama should be doing increasingly.

D. H. LAWRENCE AND HUMAN EXISTENCE, by *Martin Jarrett-Kerr,* C.R. S.C.M. Press. 8s.

This re-issue of a book first published in 1951 is essential reading for all those who wish to understand Lawrence's thought and writings.

PRIESTS AND PEOPLE, *Conor K. Ward.* Liverpool University Press. Social Research Series. 25s.

A very thorough-going analysis of a Roman Catholic parish in Liverpool, professionally done. Anglicans who tend to think that "really the Church of England is doing all right" should compare this book with "The Church's Understanding of Itself" by R. H. T. Thompson, (S.C.M. Press 8/6d.) which analyses four Anglican parishes. They will get a rude shock.

THE SIERRA LEONE CHURCH, by *R. S. Foster.* S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

A slim but thorough study of the Anglican Church in Sierra Leone pin-pointing some of the problems common to younger Churches.

THE PARISH SEEKS THE WAY, by *Michael Hocking*. Mowbrays. 10s. 6d.

An account of the successful application of all that is best in present-day Church thinking to a working-class Evangelical parish. A "must" for every parish priest.

MASS OF FIVE MELODIES, by *Patrick Appleford*. Joseph Weinberger Ltd. 5s. Choirs Edition 1s.

On St. James's Day (July 25th) this Mass of Five Melodies, produced under the auspices of the Twentieth Century Church Light Music Group, was sung for the first time, at St. George's Church, Camberwell.

It was intended to be a setting of the Communion service in the idiom of modern light music, which would not require the repetition by the people of phrases first sung by a cantor. For this to be possible it was necessary that the music should be very simple and that there should be considerable repetition of the musical phrases. This was on the whole achieved and there was no doubt that the congregation, which consisted quite largely of the youth clubs of Camberwell, were impressed by the reverence and joy of the whole composition. The organist came from the Odeon, Leicester Square, and was aided by two local guitarists. Some of the instructions for the singing gave one a very good idea of the atmosphere: "Creed—gladly, with a lilt." "Sanctus and Benedictus—Slow Rock, smoothly and a little awed."

It is probably the basic simplicity which has stopped the music having that particular punch which makes unmusical people hum Father Geoffrey Beaumont's Jazz Mass at odd times of the day without being in the slightest musical, but it is true that the Jazz Mass suffers liturgically from the length of time involved in repeating each phrase after the cantor and that this setting is much better from that point of view.

One of the most successful features of the service, however, was the hymn tunes of the 20th Century Church Light Music Group, particularly the new setting to "At the name of Jesus" by Michael Brierly which has a terrific lilt, determination and joyousness.

T.W.B.

Four Modern Psalm Tunes by the *Twentieth Century Church Light Music Group*. Joseph Weinberger 3/6d.

A Festival Te Deum by *John Alldis*. Joseph Weinberger 3/6d.

The most noteworthy feature of pop music or traditional jazz, if you just look at the score, is their harmonic poverty of invention. These pieces of music are fun to sing, written and published in order to bring church worship somewhere nearer the idiom of the Light Programme. The intention is wholly admirable but the harmonic invention remains poor. The Te Deum uses the Cantor device exploited so successfully by Geoffrey Beaumont in his Twentieth Century Folk Mass; this enables the congregation to sing without previous rehearsal as they only have one short musical phrase to memorise at a time. But the phrases do not compare in freshness with Beaumont's. The Psalm renderings are by various hands; in several cases the words are neatly accommodated, but one looks in vain for one really good new *tune*.

R.D.

Luther by *John Osborne* (Phoenix Theatre from 5th September).

I think only one religious paper—*The Methodist Recorder*—bothered to notice John Osborne's Luther, and the critic there felt that Osborne had not presented his hero very fairly. This he never set out to do, the wonder is that he selected Luther at all for such major treatment. The second wonder is that he dared to put so much religion, quite unmediated, on to the stage—the chanting of the Office, a Profession, a community confession—and that it sounded so religious. He was not guying, as his earlier attack on the church in the person of Father Evilgreene in *Slickey* made one expect. In fact he has not disclosed to us—and nor have the critics—what really was in his mind when he wrote the play. Sure Luther was an outsider and a rebel, sure the church was in a pretty corrupt state, sure the gulf between organised religion and true religion was as big as it's ever been. I think the truth is that Osborne is not so much a playright as a creator of vehicles—each of his plays presents one actor with a tour de force and what goes on in terms of narrative is of comparatively small significance. In this play he gives us a version of Luther which commands the stage and the audience absolutely, and without any easy aids. Whether or not the *Methodist Recorder* critic is right or wrong, we are given a full-size portrait of a man in whom the Life Force could not be damned. Before such

overpowering humanity there is little left for the critic to do except enjoy himself.

R.D.

(The text of "Luther" is now published by Faber at 10/6.).

THE BORED ELECTORS by *Christopher Martin,* Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd. Paper back—15s.; hard bound—21s.

This book is based on the belief that democracy is worth defending, that apologists tend to defend it on the wrong assumptions, and that better ones can and should be provided. In his introduction Christopher Martin says that he would like what he has written "to be taken as a Christian discussion of the problem," but I found this remark somewhat misleading. He has certainly written with Christian charity and insight, but broadly speaking this is not a discussion based on theological principles. There is a short section of three pages headed "An Excursion into Theology," but excursion is the operative word.

This first part of the book, which is clear and readable, is concerned with an examination of the principles on which democracy is usually defended, and in particular with the concept of "rights". We loosely say we have a right to be free or a right to own property, but in fact this is little more than an attempt to justify an existing situation with an emotive word. My right to do something frequently implies that you have not got a right to do it, and Christopher Martin suggests that privilege is a far more accurate description.

Another favourite of democratic terminology is "duties", often used in a sense in which it is contingent on "rights". The author has no trouble showing that the word can stand on its own, but I am unhappy about his desire to replace it with the lesser term "responsibilities". Undoubtedly this helps him in his examination of responsible government, but I think it leads him to false conclusions in a chapter headed "The Value of Apathy." By discarding the strong term "duty", he can argue that failure to vote is permissable as a healthy sign of non-conformity. When the failure is careful and deliberate this view may be sound, but the chapter heading shows that he is in fact considering apathy. Near the end of the book Christopher Martin says (when discussing the value of community feeling) that "as long as we content ourselves with 'responsibility', we are not immediately led into saying that

everybody must have a kind of extra-sensory sympathy with one another". But that surely is precisely what the Christian must say, and in a democracy he indeed has a duty to exercise that sympathy through the ballot box.

I found the latter part of the book somewhat harder to follow, partly because it is obviously more difficult to say what democracy is than what it is not. There is a chapter on the place of community in the modern world, another on the problems of affluence, and a third on the importance of education. Mr. Martin's general line of defence for democracy, however, seems to be summed up in his "belief that the system of government under which man live should as far as possible be correlated to their highest potentialities". Surely this is true, and forms the only sound basis for a rational critique of democracy? If, however, we continue to try and defend it on false assumptions, we can hardly expect to be victorious. I very much hope that this book will be widely read, as it could greatly help to destroy the complacent belief that democracy is self-evidently good.

PETER WHITELEY

The Church?

When the proprietor of a periodical is a parson and the editorial advisory board includes such names as the Bishops of Southwark, Woolwich and Edinburgh it is hardly surprising that T & T has a loyal church following. Each week there is an article on some Christian aspect and every religious book that comes on our bookshelves gets a review. For balanced reporting on every aspect of the political, religious and social scene there's no alternative to T & T. There is now such a demand for it that, to make sure of your copy, place an order with your newsagent. Or, write for a 6-month or year's subscription: we'll send it straight away and bill you later.

get the true picture in

TIME & TIDE

EVERY THURSDAY 1/-

Mitre House, 177 Regent Street, London W.1

THE STRUCTURE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

A. Q. MORTON and G. H. C. MACGREGOR

St. John's Gospel has for many years been the most difficult problem in New Testament criticism. This book brings the comparatively recent statistical approach to criticism to bear on some of the unsolved problems, to explain how the Fourth Gospel was written, and to show that its imperfections are due to the mechanics of book production by hand. It is completely new in its outlook and offers a new view of the other New Testament books. **15s net**

STUDIES IN NEW TESTAMENT ETHICS

WILLIAM LILLIE

In view of the current revival of Biblical Theology the author looks at what the New Testament as a whole teaches on both theoretical and practical questions. In conclusion Dr. Lillie attempts an analysis of the two central ethical concepts of the New Testament—self-denial and love. **18s net**

OLIVER & BOYD

Poetry

THE IMPATIENCE OF A CONVERT

We run to and fro in the City
And walk up and down
The gloomy canyon of Victoria Street,
Travelling there
Down the long roads of South London
Or the anonymous tube.
Our world is a desert of pavement.
We may not write poetry
About lambs or daisies any longer;
They are not real life.
We do not garner the fruits of the earth
Except in tins.

Some of us look to the Church.
(Should she not till the fields of consciousness?)
Between the bomb-sites and the bottle strewn front gardens
She has laid out a formal Dutch parterre,
Defined by neat box hedges,
A pleasant place—and through the arch you'll find
A vague untidy playground
For children of all ages.

But now we are not children,
And how long must we go on playing?
We have drunk from the fountain in the garden;
When can we start to dig?
When shall we grow our runner beans and spinach,
And roses to give to our friends?
When shall we be allowed to turn the old waste places
Back into fields,
The fields where sheep may feed?

ELEANOR TARVER

MATTHEW

Seven times I chanced to catch his eye—
Seven times I tried to go but could not
Could not pass him by.
I did not want to stay with him standing there,
I did not want to talk, still less to walk
With him: what did he want of me?
I turned my head away
And watched the people across the street
Or read the numbers of stationary cars
While trying to think of something to think about
To take my mind off the look he gave me.
I didn't want to meet
A complete stranger—especially one like him,
Who looked to me, well, different—
And well, one never knows nowadays
Whether . . . I glanced at him again
And in his eyes, deep penetrating mines,
I saw reflected the whole sky;
And as I looked, he beckoned me,
Making an easy gesture with his hand.
I flushed, and turned, and tried
To focus my eyes on a nearby shop-sign,
Wiping my neck the while.

"Matthew!"
My God, how did he know—
My name? And dare I walk away
As if I were David or Joe?
Or dare I look openly at him again?
I turned, and into his reflected sky
Looking, heard him say, to me of all men:
"Matthew, follow me!"

Anthony Hyland

BRIDEGROOM AND BRIDE

Helium bridegroom has hydra-bride:
Seasonal circular cult corker
For any ritualistic king victor,
Jail poker, prince or pauper

To have and hold his belladonna,
His hierophantic queen or whore.
Harvest the problem prospected by
This requisite conjunction—even in war

When its multiplicity in capture
Of cities might be considered an aim,
Or division in their loss, tho' never
With loss of face, never itself to blame.

Denatured, secular ages substitute
Relativities, but with a like result.
See how anyone can make of any moment
And its fancy a relative occult

Conjunction of contraries, an animus
And anima of nature's zeitgeist
Etceteras! At least the one moment
Above all in the persona of Christ:

Animus and anima conjunction,
Its seasons or relativities
Bound to the one act his person
Makes history of, its pluralities

To the unity consummating his person;
And all the odds mustering to break it
(As when women clung to the body men
Forsook in death: its flight of spirit

Seeking to embalm, anoint with spices).
So it is that every bridegroom and bride
Who pollinate their bond from the act
Consummating his person, cannot hide

Or thwart it by seasons, relativities.
Add to this their expectation of children:
Each in its person to be of them both
A relative, constant likeness in union.

FRANK BUCHANAN

I JONATHAN

This is my burden—to be a man
Yet not as other men, living
And loving in a foreign way;
But though I stand apart from them
I am no better than they.

I cannot hope to be other than I am,
And what I am I stand by
Not denying, unashamed
Of my old Adam; knowing that I am
What I am from my mother's womb,
From my father's eye.

Man, though, it is a burden unshared
And the nub of my burden is this:
He it is I long for
Without hope of consummation,
He it is, and he it is . . .
Can there be no quenching of my burning,
No hope of other loves than his?
Is there never hope of love turning
Into comradeship and freeing
Me from his sweet bondages?

Between us there can be no union,
No fruition; even so,
I with my heart's longing
Cannot bear to let him go.

To be a man—that is my burden.

ANTHONY HYLAND.

Precious Stones

S. M. M. Crichton

Precious stones have been used many times in our Bible, and in the sacred writings of other faiths, as a poetic way of illustrating the idea that it is for us all to take part in the building of the Heavenly City, the City that is built by the lives of the Saints and mystics, and by all who follow the True Way.

The idea is given to us that we may each see ourselves as being analogous to a precious stone, which must first be dug out of the mud in which it is embedded. At first it does not look very prepossessing. It is of irregular shape, and covered in mud. All the dirt must be removed from it. It must be drilled and ground into shape, a painful tedious process requiring much skill. It can then be finally polished, and all its inward lights and colours revealed. Only then may it be found fit to use for its true purpose, the placing in the walls for the building of the Heavenly City.

The City is built of precious stones, the offerings of the lives of many dedicated souls.

And the Gateways to the City are made of pearl.

The PEARL has a special reason for being called the gateway to the City, for it comes into being in a unique and special way. A minute speck of sand or other irritant gets into the oyster. The oyster patiently, steadily and gently covers this discomfort or pain with a smooth white substance which eventually turns into a pearl, which may be of great beauty and value.

We also have small annoyances and troubles that penetrate our defences and cause us discomfort. For our first small lessons, we have to learn to cover these annoyances with the smooth gentle covering of faith. And in doing so, we may eventually find that they have turned into things of beauty, which we may think of as gates of pearl, through which we pass through for our first steps on the Inward Path.

Having passed through the gates, we then come to the foundations of the City.

The stone that is given to us as the first foundation is the JASPER, the dull red stone of suffering. The jasper is thick, dull, opaque; for it is common to all suffering that we do not as a rule see

through it to its purpose. It is semi-precious. We do not value suffering very highly at the time. Yet if we can bear it to the Holy City, we are told that it then becomes transformed, clear, translucent. "The Light was like unto a jasper stone, clear, most precious", not giving light of itself, but reflecting the light that shines through it.

The second foundation is the SAPPHIRE, the stone of Truth. The deep-blue, almost blackness of its depths, symbolises the deep inward Truth, which few have the courage really to face. We all find ourselves looking at the half-truths of our own ideas, our own feelings. It requires much heroic courage really to look away from ourselves to the ONE. "Abide in the Sanctuary of Truth, and so slay all doubt with the sword of the Kerubim".

The next stone is the CHALCEDONY. It comes in different colours, flawless, no false colours in it of any kind.

The next stone is the EMERALD. This is the stone of Faith. It is the colour of the earth, of growing things. Yet with a transparency, as of earthly things seen with the eye of faith—God's love seen as being near even when surrounded by earthly things. It is the courage that is not afraid to dwell in dark places, as the eye of faith sees beyond, "And there was a rainbow round about the throne like unto an emerald".

The SARDONYX is then given, and may be taken as the symbol of the imperfect life. It is veined, and with imperfections, yet with fair patches—the frequent pull of earthly desires, and the life that brings its offering after many falls.

The BERYL OR AQUAMARINE is the beautiful transparent sea-blue stone of peace—the peace of the evening, of the soul that has attained. The morning stone is the TURQUOISE, the pale forget-me-not blue stone of innocence, of untroubled happiness. But the blue of the beryl or aquamarine is transparent, more unearthly, the blue of the evening, as of the soul that has come through suffering to peace.

The beautiful clear gold of the TOPAZ is the stone of pure joy, the lovely fruit of many other qualities that have gone before. It is the colour of gold, of treasure, but with a transparence as of earthly treasure laid aside, and heavenly treasures sought. It is different from the untried purity of the crystal, which is not one of the foundations of the City. The topaz, like the crystal, reflects the light that shines on it, but adds to it its own deep golden tints.

The CHRYSOPRASE, most beautiful of stones, is the stone of Praise. It is a clear green, tinged with gold—faith and joy. It is not the outward praise of words, but the inward praise—too deep for words. The beholding that is so real that it cannot be spoken—yet it shines through in word and action.

And lastly we have the purple AMETHYST, the colour which the far-distant hills take on. It represents steadfast dedication to the goal. It is the stone of patience and humility—patience which keeps its eye steadfastly on the goal, and humility which is not afraid to learn from others.

And so, we are told, the Holy City of Jewels is built by all who aspire, and we try to bear our own precious stone to lay on the foundations of those that have gone before—the clear jasper stone of the suffering of the martyrs, the deep, emerging sapphire truth of the prophets, the chrysoprase of the mystics, all shine with many comforting rays and hues for those who follow.

And they shine, not with their own light, but with the light that shines on them.

Our Contributors

Bishop Stephen Neill. For 20 years missionary in South India. Author of many books. At present General Editor of *World Christian Books*.

Canon S. Val Green is Vicar of Holmside in Durham and Rural Dean of Lanchester.

John Cowan is Curate of St. Michael's, Coppenhall, Diocese of Chester.

Colonel Madge is a member of the Royal College of Surgeons and is a member of the House of Laity of the Church Assembly for Winchester.

John Gunstone was trained at Mirfield and is curate-in-charge of St. Augustine's, Romford.

PETER WHITELEY

Saki's Reginald remarked of one of his characters that "he farmed in Warwickshire but was otherwise quite steady". Peter Whiteley farms in Northamptonshire which would seem an odd occupation to combine with being Religious Editor of the *Time & Tide* Group of Papers, but no doubt contact with the soil will help keep the religious pages from becoming too airy-fairy. Aged 33, he was elected to the House of Laity of the Church Assembly, second in the poll for Peterborough, at the last election after sending out an election address which contained, among other things, the following statements:

"While the Church should certainly have a true respect for tradition, we must be prepared where necessary to reconsider and reassess our whole parochial system which, at present, is largely patterned on an England of several centuries ago, which wastes so many of the best of our clergy and isolates others in loneliness and, sometimes, even in despair. We must consider how to train for the priesthood more men who may have left school at fifteen. We must consider how the laity can play a far larger part in our parishes, leaving the parson to do his essential pastoral job free from the worries of Church fetes and finances. It is quite possible that you and I might find many changes personally inconvenient, or even disturbing. But surely that is a false yardstick?"

Peter now reports Church Assembly debates for PRISM and does it with considerable charity considering his speech last session in which he attacked the Assembly for its lack of effectiveness, a speech to which the *Church Times* devoted its first leader in the following week.

Peter is now taking over the major responsibility for the *National Christian News* and will also be taking over "World and the Church" page in *Time & Tide* in the near future.

The Bored Electors

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN

Exposes some of our outdated modes of thinking about politics, and points to our unquestioning acceptance of these as the root cause of political apathy today. *cased* 21*s*, *paper* 18*s net*.

St John the Baptist and the Kingdom of Heaven

G. C. DARTON

'An extremely penetrating study of one of the greatest figures of the New Testament.' *The Expository Times*. *paper* 7*s* 6*d net*.

The Bridge Builders

Biographical Studies in the History of Anglicanism

HUGH A. LAWRENCE RICE

The lives of nine great Anglicans, from Cranmer to Gore. 18*s net*

History and Myth

DAVID COX

'. . . Man today is in desperate need of assurance that his deepest hopes and desires can be fulfilled in the external environment within which he is forced to live his life . . . the confluence of myth and history in the life of Jesus can provide him with the assurance which he needs. In order to reach this solution I have wandered into many fields of study . . .' So the author writes in his preface, in over-modest allusion to his wide awareness of modern scientific and psychological developments. *paper* 18*s net*.

DARTON, LONGMAN & TODD

Printed by Oxley & Son (Windsor) Ltd., 4 High Street, Windsor